

Thinking of undefined sets compared with the empty set they are different, notably at electrons. Quora says of electrons as probabaility distributions around the nucleus “But not having a unique, classically meaningful value does not mean that the quantity is zero” So the “shape”, which possibly be like what remains of a monad aftwer the forgetful functor is removed could be a variety of math functions, from a probability to a matrix, to something like a 1d numberline to a fractal. It is possible that the forgetful functor, after it is removed from the monad is also this data shape. So either possibility could be a thing.

from a quora answer to **“Are there complexities that even the smartest among us have a hard time grasping?:**

“Well it’s easy to find people that are smarter than something near my

peak; you could just have a cash prize onsite at MIT or CalTech to be given to the measurably most creative person on psychology tests, like those of divergent thinking. It would perhaps take you about 5 hours to plan the screening activity; then you recruit temps online to show up on campus and do the testing on campus. Congratulations! you have found people smarter than I am!

I personally am sloppy and lazy about figuring out the physics basis of unitary many worlds interpretation as compared with non-unitary.

here, you can watch me having a hard time grasping a complexity:

Unitary: it all happened

Non Unitary: Some of it is at a time coordinate different than the rest of it at having happeningness

OK, the glittery first idea, which is replaced with better ones, is that whether to perceive the truth is nearer to unitary or non unitary MWI (Everettian physics), is highly similar to refuting determinism; the clockwork universe view.

One refutation of determinism is to simply modify the source of the universe to have more than one starting point, with the two starting points separated by a measurable thing. An overly-facile-so-is-likely-too-simple version would be a big bang that arises from two separate points simultaneously, yet at a distance such that the two co-bangs have lightcone exclusivity to each other. The areas at the locational tips where the branches of the two cobangs meet would not be predictable by anything, computer or human, in the set of two, determined, clockwork universes produced with each co-bang.

Sounds fun and sensible so far, but you asked about the “hard time grasping” part. I do not comprehend string theory, but the locational difference of the two (or more) co-bangs could actually be differences in the “rolled up” 11 dimensions of string theory rather than the “two co-bangs a few meters away from each other” visual I started with.

Then there are all the other possible ways of breaking determinism, if it has not yet been broken (or was absent being there in the first place). Also, at these changes to determinism things expand from including retrocausal modifications, as supported with the actual physics of the delayed quantum choice eraser, or better technologies.

Now more about “hard time grasping” Well, I think I should figure this out. Intent is part of effort to grasp. One reason is that **a truth-verified position on the many worlds interpretation of physics would change almost all of ethics**, as far as I am aware. Unitary/non-unitary MWI would affect all

actual personal agency. So, if a person figures this out then it is nearer possible to be able to **figure out what to do**.

I am under the impression that I thought of about 3 refutations of determinism, or technologies to break determinism that could be utilized **if they are the right thing to do**. Which brings up, as an aside:

Many scientifically studied things have transitions, physical phase changes, and form variations. If you don't know anything about something, it, perhaps, depending on a kind of taxonomic geography (or visualization) of isness, usually has embodied/endefinitioned variation. Translation: there's a lot of change, what if many things like "determinism" or "source of universe" also have change built-in?

Is it plausible to extend that multi-form variation to such things as:

Making "determinism" have phases, just like chemistry graphs, or math graphs

Making **math** have multi-form phases; similar to phase diagrams at chemistry, where something like a triple point (or any kind of group of phases), as well as the interesting whole-form effects next to it (bulk ice, steam, water) exist. And where these phase-maps are ways of graphing or understanding **actual used math** like that used at physics equations, **even noting the presence of things like Godel's math incompleteness thing**.

I kind of imagine a 3d version of where things are graspably relative to each other (like enumerable distance, but better than enumerabaly). Not saying "relative"="casually relatable" just saying, math could be arrangeable with something rather like a 3d spatial (or some other non-physics thing) phase map or actual "territory" with distances between identities, where the phases of math relate to each other beyond binary proof to have areas of truthability.

Giving math a phase diagram of area validity or effect, could, at its clunkiest, just produce something like a 3d venn-diagram, likely time adjustable, relation of what can be part of some one thing or another. **That could be a relativisation of math. There's a non-clunky deeper version though, which is what I actually mean.**

So, as far as "grasping" things you can see I have some vast room for improvement. I support genetically engineering humans to be 3, 4, or 5 times more intelligent than I am (and they can then decide if they want to be smarter after that); I also support the creation of nonsentient AI that has much more workalike-to-intelligence as humans.

It is possible that a relativisation of math could address determinism. People or AI 5 times smarter than me might find it easy and obvious to change determinism or move it to a different one of its several possible phases that might be going on."

(Quora material was written on phenibut rather than phenylethylamine)

online advice on lowering blood pressure on phenylethylamine, although the advice seems to concentrate on the deprenyl part, "Nifedipine, a calcium channel blocker, used to be the go to for MAOI related hypertensive crises but this is no longer recommended. I am unsure of the usefulness of other drugs with this mechanism of action. An α 1 blocker (ie. prazosin) or α 2 agonist (ie. clonidine) would be good to have on hand." <https://www.bluelight.org/vb/threads/825910-What-happens-to-phenylethylamine-when-combined-with-selegiline>

Studies link oral gingivitis to alzheimers

<https://www.newscientist.com/article/2191814-we-may-finally-know-what-causes-alzheimers-and-how-to-stop-it/> and heart disease. Immunization to some oral bacteria prevents it. **It could be that copper goop mixed with tooth plaque applied to a sore could immunize against gingivitis**, reducing risk of disease. The thing is that one of the risky bacteria is *P. gingivalis* and tooth plaque is

mostly *S. mutans*. I could get a couple rotting teeth pulled... Another possibility is once every 3 months antibiotics along with a probiotic. Dental probiotics also exist, I think.

MWI: A possible way to make an already observed object have nondeterminacy again

<https://www.newscientist.com/article/dn20712-how-to-be-in-two-places-at-the-same-time/> : “Physicists have questioned whether large objects can follow quantum laws ever since Erwin Schrödinger’s thought-experiment suggested a cat could exist in a superposition of being both alive and dead.

The idea is to zap a glass sphere 40 nanometres in diameter with a laser while it is inside a small cavity. This should force the sphere to bounce from one side of the cavity to the

other. But since the light is quantum in nature, so too will be the position of the sphere. This forces it into a quantum superposition."..." The new experiment, in contrast, would put the glass sphere in two entirely distinct places at once, with no overlap." So, **nudge something with a quantum source.**

MWI: if MWI universes propagate at a lightcone rather than instantly, **then just possibly nudging them with a quantum system, like the glass globes, early enough could circumscribe the physical are of the MWI universe, perhaps limiting it to the volume of a human or a computer chip.** The thing is, this might only produce nondeterminacy at some subset of possible things a person could

measure at a system. Although **a laser zapping glass globes to make their physical location nondeterminate (rather than just some electron photon thing) seems to suggest big area-spanning effects from quantum nudging.**

Also, noting the glass globes can be superposed with a laser **could there be large-area naturally occurring effects that “restore” preobservation quantum nondeterminacy at astrophysicist-study-sized objects**; “When they apply quantum mechanics – which successfully describes the behaviour of very small objects like atoms – to the entire cosmos, the equations imply that it must exist in many different states simultaneously, a

phenomenon called a superposition. Yet that is clearly not what we observe.

Cosmologists reconcile this seeming contradiction by assuming that the superposition eventually “collapses” to a single state. But they tend to ignore the problem of how or why such a collapse might occur”

MWI: is it ethically beneficial to generate new universes populated only by one happy boltzmann brain? A utilitarian, and I am thinking of David Pearce, and likely me, could compare/contrast boltzmann brains to solving (FTF, AFS, others) a society. Finely tuned lasers might do it.

MWI: “If many worlds is correct – and many physicists think it is – my actions shape the course not just of my life, but of the lives of my duplicates in other worlds.

“In the many-worlds interpretation, when you make a choice the other choices also happen,” David Deutsch”. That suggests **that things might be more ethical with software that automatically placed a list of highly beneficial things at any to-do list the person wrote.** Nifty phone app as well.

MWI: “This concept sprouts from eternal inflation, our best explanation for why the universe looks as it does. In the split second after the big bang, the idea goes, space-time expanded exponentially.” **It is possible that**

the MWI supports something other than a big bang, and further, even if there was a big bang, the geometry of the starting event would have a wide number of varying original geometries. If you make a list of all the geometries you can think of, the likelihood that the one drawn stoachastically would be spherical inflation, would be really improbable. I might be ignorant about the math meaning of stochastic item from a list. I do not know what would be more probable, but if you grab a stochastic item off a list of thought-of (and as yet unthought-of) geometries, the likelihood of any particular geometry is minuscule. **Rather drastic sounding is the possibility that a universe origin could be figured out from finding out which math**

identities apply more to what seems-to-be-reality. As a sample math identity... It is very very likely different than the median, mean or mode of a pile of data, Very likely universe origin math is completely different than an average, “Using the ‘its from a math average math motif’; twentieth century AD English language version of “make believe”: the universe origin was of a size midway between the largest galaxy and a hydrogen atom” so about the size of a ... (oil tanker/ski resort/child sized snowball)” With different than that “make believe” example, “average” is a kind of math definitional space, so a math-cabable person could think of other “organizing math motifs”. A person at stackexchange.com says, “For example, the Pythagorean theorem proves something exact about the

properties of triangles, even if we cannot measure any triangle with infinite precision." So reapplicability of the pythagorean theorem, even with numbers with of imprecise measurements, as well as the ability to swap out any of the actual numbers with lettered variables at an equation is like a mathematics motif.

You could look at what most every physics observable thing or system has, then weight (math word) the origin to have some of that too. Then, theoretically, once you have a non big-bang theory that is a pastiche of what is known about other things, you do new fresh observations and experiments to rule out parts of the pastiche. Then you get a extraneous-stuff trimmed out version of a universe origin theory, one that skips depending on a stoachastic sample

from a list, like I perceive big bang to be.

MWI: A technology that does quantum insulation could be nifty, also nifty is reverse-superobserving something back to quantum nondeterminacy: “By contrast, small things like photons and electrons are more easily isolated from their environment, so they can be preserved in a superposition for longer” **So, something other than a vacuum, like a reverse-superobserver, perhaps a computer that made billions of imprecise measurements a second on something, could be quantitatively measured as to whether or not it makes known quantum superposed matter to stay superposed longer: a reverse**

superobserver The MWI part is that you could create regions with reduced universe generation or that are absent universe generation, **until the moment when the most ethical version was created**: Get parts, assemble them under a reverse superobserver, **then observe once the beneficial technological object is fully constructed**.

MWI: It is possible a reverse-superobserver could do beneficial repairs on the universe.
Somewhat startlingly, half of all of a group are definitionally below average; that suggests that using a reverse-superobserver to cause half the universe to be reverse-superobserved into nondeterminacy, then, if development makes sense,

purposefully observe the recently re-nondemined region. Half of the newly reobserved half would then be above average; this causes the universe to be 3/4 above average.

This 3/4 above average could be amplified to 99% or higher above the previous average. Gamete choice, where people optimize the sperm or eggs they use to create children could be the re-resolved thing to make 99% or greater above the previous dissolved and recreated universe' average composition.

MWI, new form of time: some people have worked on probabilities at the MWI, <https://www.newscientist.com/arti>

[**cle/mg21128253-700-time-need-not-end-in-the-multiverse/**](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC21128253/)

“cosmologists, who want to use probabilities to make predictions”...”How can we say that anything is more or less probable than anything else?

“One procedure physicists are fond of is to draw a cut-off at some finite time, count up the number of events – say, heads and tails – that occur in the multiverse before the cut-off time, and use that as a representative sample.”

“you are handed a fair coin to flip. You will not be allowed to see the outcome, and the moment the coin lands you will fall into a deep sleep. If the coin lands heads up, [a person] will wake you 1 minute later; tails, in 1 hour. Upon waking, you will have no idea how long you have just slept.”...”would you like [to make a

preference known for] heads or tails? Knowing it's a fair coin, you assume your odds are 50/50, so you choose tails [long nap]." [The person] knows you will almost certainly [not get your preference], because she is factoring in something you haven't: that we live in a multiverse.

..."something strange happens. Wherever the cut-off is drawn, it slices through some of the [potential napper's] naps, making it appear as if those [nappers] simply never woke up. The longer the nap, the more likely it is to be cut off, so if you do awaken, it's more likely that you have taken a shorter nap – that is, that you flipped heads. So even though the odds seemed to be 50/50 when the coins were first flipped, heads becomes more probable than tails once you and the other [person] wake

up.

“This thought experiment was unbelievably perplexing at first, because it seemed like probabilities were changing from one instant to the next without any explanation,” says Alan Guth of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who along with Vitaly Vanchurin of Stanford University in California, came up with the conundrum two years ago.

Last year, Raphael Bousso at the University of California, Berkeley, and colleagues devised an explanation that was effective, if unsettling. The changing probabilities were behaving as if time ends at the cut-off, they said, because time really does end at the cut-off. That’s why the initial 50/50 odds change when you wake up from your nap.

Upon waking, you have new information: you know that time didn't end. That now means it is more likely that you only slept for a minute than for an hour. After all, time could end at any minute, and an hour has an extra 59 of those to spare. Heads wins.

The idea that time must end for the probabilities to make sense has been bugging Guth and Vanchurin for the last year. Now they say they have developed a mathematical explanation for the multiverse that saves the fourth dimension (arxiv.org/abs/1108.0665).

The essence of the argument is that you don't need any new information, in this case the fact that you woke up, to understand why the odds are no longer 50/50. In a multiverse that grows exponentially, where each new generation of universes is far larger

than the last, younger universes always outnumber older ones. Waking up, you will either be in a universe in which 1 minute has passed (heads), or in a universe in which 1 hour has passed (tails). **“The experiment sets up a 59-minute ambiguity in the age of the universe,”** Guth says. “You should always [preferentially favor] on the younger one.”” (my perception of what this is saying is that because you are much more likely to be in a recent branch of a young universe the long nap/short nap odds go back to equal; there’s almost no likelihood of early termination)
So, could some variation on this create customized intervals of ambiguous time?

Would there be any advantage to the previously written material on how using a delayed quantum choice

eraser (DQCE) to retrocausally observe which sperm sample was used to create a child, causing a future ability to rechoose the sperm sample, and associated person's characteristics be applied with this different 59 minute time ambiguity? Say you have 10 super wonderful sperm samples. To create and emphasize benefit, the parent could even be measured as variably preferring one over the other, the variance depending on the day they thought about it. **That's an approach to determining two equally valued sperm samples. Then do the two-item MWI probability thing described at New Scientist, producing a 20 year "time ambiguity" as to the well being and generally beneficence of the child.** One child cures death, the other is Jeffrina Bezos

who started Amazon.com, reducing incurred expenses for any particular product across the global economy. Curing death is better, so is there a way to use the 20 year ambiguity to populate the largest number of universes with the cure for death? The delayed quantum choice eraser (DQCE) is a possible approach.

The advantage here is that if, as the article says, the vast majority of children are/will be created in newly branched universes, then **you can populate these larger quantity of MWI universes with more optimal genetically optimized children.** This then of course benefits the other people that interact with them, as well as the society generally.

Noting the New Scientist “time ambiguity” where you know you are usually populating new universes, you

can populate the many new universe branches with optimized genetics of children. You can use retrocausally different sperm or eggs, based on the 20 year interval of measuring wellness, including happiness, and beneficence of the children, using the DCQE. Doing that retrocausally with the DQCE might move the better sperm up (more previous) at the causal/MWI tree's branching limb, from the 20 year evaluation-based rechoice (rechoice, unless you like the outcome at your universe). The thing about changing the past is that you also populate a really vast number of MWI branch universes. I am not yet aware of anything online that figures out the difference in volume of effect from changing pretime things as compared with the volume of effect from a bunch of fresh branches at Now time. It could be that the area-

volume of new universe things grows at a constant rate regardless of when it occurs.

Perhaps if you are making one selection out of 1000 equally perceived as wonderful sperm samples, the process can be repeated at a multiplex/1000 laser path DQCE to (noting the varied beneficence of the different children at your universe) find the most optimal of the 1000 sperm samples.

MWI test: It looks like if you are in a branch universe rather than the origin universe when observing the DQCE into changing the past, at your recently produced branch, **you would/might not reach the actual originating DQCE, but a possibly a “DQCE facsimile” that does not affect all the intervening years’ MWI generated universes.**

Although DQCE is published as retrocausal, if you make one, and if it does not go backwards in time to make an actual change., it might mean you are at a branch, recently created universe. I am perhaps not figuring out how to tell the difference, but **detecting the difference between a facsimile (inactive) DQCE and an actual DQCE event could be a test of the MWI because it would demonstrate near-copy universes that branch out.**

That suggests that if you can use the DQCE to actually change the past you are at the source universe; otherwise you just “toggle” a facsimile which does not do anything. um, but **then there's the usefulness of time insulation...** How can a person tell the difference? The expected result is

that, as usual, you have children. With the past changed you cannot tell if they grow to be, and are genetically different people at this iteration of sperm/egg choice. An external data repository Quantum insulator could be beneficial.

Quantum sequestration: Finding a way to insulate things in time would permit you to save the identity of the original sperm preference and compare it to the new more preferred sperm preference that the child has as a genome. Perhaps the fiber optic loop around radioactive sample that nests MWI universes in each other's time space and/or lightcone could be modified to provide a universe-independent data repository (for things like what the children were like with the

previous sperm/egg sample). **This might work better at all the subsequent branches of the MWI after the optical loop and radioactive sample mechanism is built.** The radioactivity is a near instantaneous MWI measurement-observable difference; the optical loop that circles it can be tuned to minutes or longer; the existence of the radioactive event's branched universes depends on the outcome of the photon emission/detection at the optical loop. That suggests that the branch universes sourced from the radiation event on are contained at the delay-to-measure and lightcone of the optical loop, so a radio-based branch universe might be able to use the optical loop as a data repository that is independent of the varied branches the radioactive one goes on. You can also just use two (or more)

optical loops, with them physically surrounding the faster one to use the more gradual one as a data repository.

A person at stackexchange.com writes, “The charge of the universe is said to be zero. The most general argument I hear about this is that: since there was no net charge before the universe there must not be any after. Hence the universe is neutral.”

Side note: Neutral seems strange considering the casimir effect can generate electrons out of vacuum, it might be entertaining from a universe as neutrally charged investigative thing to find out if the casimir effect produces the same number of positrons as electrons. Casimir effect suggests spontaneous tilt-like anisotropy to charge. Just writing things: although I think there is something more accurate than the big

bang theory, big bang theorists might find the idea of casimir fluctuations at the perimeter of an expanding point to be associated with electromagnetic bending of particle pathways. So for big bang theorists, the electrons sourced from, or developed from a big bang might veer away from casimir produced electrons or positrons, causing anisotropy (variation) at the developed universe from early charge veering anisotropy. There is something I have no clue about called “breaking symmetry” at physics; casimir generation of particles and charges that other things veer away from, or towards, could cause asymmetry. I kind of think they (physicists) mean something different for “how did asymmetry occur” though, it might have to do with the catalog of phycis particles or something.

Stackexchange person further says, “[universe allegedly neutral charge]... But since many theorists believe in a multi-verse*, shouldn't the total charge of the multiverse be zero and **individual universes might or might not have charges?**

“Therefore the idea of different parallel universes having different charges” as a reply to, “

Publish MWI technologies and approaches at stackexchange.com

wikipedia says, “In mathematics, an **automorphism is an isomorphism from a mathematical object to itself. It is, in some sense, a symmetry of the object, and a way of mapping the object to itself while preserving all of its structure”** It also says at symmetry that there is a list of components, that

is required math things, that when all of them are present causes a particular definition of symmetry to be met.

So thinking about what wikipedia says about automorphism, makes me think of set theory and matrices. At automorphisms there are some math things, perhaps math identities described at wikipedia, Automorphism reminds me of set theory and matrices; like it has some math identities, possibly arranged at a list, or a relational group (Venn diagrams influencing me) (another group that relates: a matrix) that when they are fulfilled operationalize the definition of an automorphism. So from a set theory thing: it seems like :wikipedia about automorphism: “an isomorphism from a mathematical

object to itself. It is, in some sense, a symmetry of the object, and a way of mapping the object to itself while preserving all of its structure””

So thinking MWI, is there a something with more, or perhaps less, math-part components to make purposeful automorphism differences at a branch universe (and also automorphism differences at radioactive blob with optical loop nesting technology and math identity)? If (math word:) symmetry matters at the MWI, the nested universe radioactive loop generator could have entirely different novel mathematical venn-diagram like things as well as different technical dimensionality(Technical dimensionality: **imagining the way a math definitional:knot seems to require 3 dimensions to do a flip**)

radioactive optical loop could possibly introduce more degrees of freedom as it is 3D instead of 1D or 2D like a MWI branch from a quantum event like a electron level hopping and emitting a photon. **The greater degrees of freedom at a 3d object compared with a 1D or 2D object suggest technologizable opportunities.**

MWI Test: I may have previously have written about looking at each part (usually letter-symbol) of the schrodinger equation and then seeing it it could require more than it says or even have that letter-symbol refuted. Doing that effectively would change the equation on which the MWI is based. Wikipedia lets me know there is another equation I can modify to effect change at the

MWI, “

Being casual; **is there anything in the universe that is absent fittability into a hilbert space?**

Wikipedia says that quantum physics is embedded in hilbert space, so if there are any hilbert space exceptions at the observable universe **those could affect MWI things from modifying or going outside of quantum things.** Any physical thing outside hilbert space would function differently than: “if a system is in a state described by a vector in a Hilbert space, the measurement process affects the state in a non-deterministic but statistically predictable way. In particular, after a measurement is applied, the state description by a single vector may be destroyed, being replaced by a

statistical ensemble." So it looks like anything outside of Hilbert space means you get to skip any/all wave function collapse mechanisms and the MWI.

To find something outside of Hilbert space: list off things it has to do, and is precluded from doing. Then find things that are outside that; possible example: could the *abstraction* of a turing machine be outside Hilbert space because it is not an elaborated euclidean system or thing, it is a looping repositioning thing. Also a nonorientatable surface or object like a klein thing or mobius loop might exclude orthagonaility and be inner productless. Also at a turing machine or 1,1,0 automata you could possibly make one with a non-orientable

mobius strip as the tape it runs on. To make one you might need 3D, but skip vectors, and can skip the inner product thing completely. “A Hilbert space is an abstract vector space possessing the structure of an inner product that allows length and angle to be measured” **Similarly the 1,1,0 automata might be runnable on a non-hilbert space thing. Maybe a circular 1,1,0 automata radial blob could exist and compute without length and angle. Or a turing machine instead of a [direction and quantity] vector could just have assembly language like instructions that just repeatedly modified their content at a grid or matrix; that makes a thing that omits the “vector” that hilbert space might require.** Similarly at what I

perceive as the paranormal, if hilbert space prefers 3 things, but the paranormal only do 2, then the paranormal could be outside of hilbert space, and notably paranormal activity would be a nonquantum system. That even though no one knows what it is or how it works. Scientific verification of the paranormal could possibly create a checkbox knowledge array just from finding out how the paranormal matches up, or does not match up to Hilbert space things in the set of behaviors and intrinsic characteristics

One online thing says, “Hilbert spaces have inner products, so notions of perpendicularity(or orthogonality), and orthogonal projection are available.”

Orthogonalness seems like it might be possible for something to completely lack it; what about a non-orientable surface? If these exclude orthogonality, then they might, if made of some other thing, be physical objects outside of a hilbert space description. Klien or mobius thing is I think a non-orientatable (non orthogonal) surface/shape. What if you put a zipper along the center of a mobius loop, with orientation neutral meshing teeth; when zipped it makes two overlapping loops, zipped it looks like a mobius loop.

What is a little amusing here is that instead of some 20th century AD books exploring quantum physics as a generator of consciousness, A mathematical

matching up of the requirements of hilbert space and finding out where consciousness or the paranormal doesn't fill all the check boxes to qualify as being Hilbert spacial could show that consciousness and/or the paranormal is outside quantum physics. That less than hilbert space and also different than hilbert space group of characteristics creates a vast new area of technologyizable beneficial things. So missing the checkboxes on “qualifies as Hilbert spacial” could be a beneficial source of new things.

Wikipedia says, “Mathematically, a **pure quantum state** can be represented by a ray in a Hilbert space over the complex numbers”

so, rummaging for original content, yet again, the radioactive loop **nested MWI universe generator**, or a different topology of it beyond nesting, which includes a “flip” might, like a knot, only fit in higher dimensionality (like 3D) That is different than a 1D or 2D photon-electron event. So technologically, is there some easy fun variation on MWI radioactive loop nesting, or some niftier technology, that makes a flip to knot, **Crochet a MWI universe connection space.**

A **3d** crochet of MWI nests/connections and mapping could have more possible degrees of freedom, sort of like a greater number of vertice connections; more than a measured or resolved at a quantum event with just 2 branches like an electron photon thing. The elctron

photon thing might be 1D or 2D so it has less connectors possible per point or vertice where it lives.

Having three or four connectors on a vertice (from nesting topology/degree of freedom) would mean the nestized geometry MWI might be theorized to produce 3 or 4 seperate universes per event rather than just one near clone universe. Perhaps the crocheting of the nested overlapping MWI universe generators could even have **direction of flow effects, waterhammer, or valving** as to things like the optical loop providing a data repository to the quicker mini loop or radioactive lump.

So, there is the possibility that a person developing a mathmematical description of the nested loop MWI connector might notice or produce things in their new equations which

lead to new MWI technologies and possibly MWI testability. Sort of like saying, if the mathematicians think of it, the physicists and engineers can use the math as a creative launch point to do their things.

GSK: Could topical tyramine or perhaps more likely, niacin cause localized higher blood flow, causing the other ingredients in a beauty cream or antidermatitis cream to have greater transport to the tissue, like beauty pepetides with tyramine get more capillary accessibility

Genetics of the feeling-style when feeling great: It is possible that the style of being in a good mood or even a cognitively-or emotionally sourced euphoria (like Idea thrills, falling in love) could have to do with the trace amino acid receptor genes.
Phenylethylamine affects TAAR

receptors, and at me seems to have a particular style of mood elevation and openness to cognitive daring. So, as wikipedia says, “Phenethylamine has been shown to bind to two human trace amine-associated receptors, hTAAR1 and hTAAR2, as an agonist.”

That suggests that SNPs or gene variants of hTAAR could cause people **to feel great in a particular style.**

They could quantitatively measure some (psychology word:) dimensions of **how people with different hTAAR genes feel** when they are in love, get a happy event, as well as other things that naturally causes those people’s hTAAR receptors to be activated. That would map out styles and forms of feel-great experiences and link them to genes. Then, optimizing things like the feeling of love as well as things like idea-thrills could be accomplished with giving

humans the most beneficial Feel-great genes available. This technology improves people's love lives.

Genetics of “children with genes causing high levels of MAO-A were less likely to develop antisocial behavior.” (wikipedia)